DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 818 RC 014 585

TITLE	Refugees and Migrants: Problems and Program Responses. A Look at the Causes and Consequences of Today's Major International Population Flows, and at the Ford Foundation's New Programs to Address the Problems of Refugees and Migrants in the United States and Elsewhere in the World. A Working Paper.
INSTITUTION	Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Aug 83
NOTE	66p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, NY 10017.
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Education; Civil Liberties; Culture Contact; Developing Nations; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Financial Support; Foreign Countries; Health Services; Housing; Illiteracy; Indochinese; *International Programs; Limited English Speaking; Literacy Education; Mexicans; *Migrants; *Migration; National Programs; Population Growth; Public Affairs Education; *Refugees; *Research Needs
IDENTIFIERS	*Ford Foundation

ABSTRACT

The paper reflects the Ford Foundation's emphasis since 1980 on long-term problems of refugees and migrants across national borders, and the desire of the Foundation staff to strengthen the long-term capacity of key institutions and communities to cope with population flows. Focus is first on the consequences of migrant flows for sending and receiving countries, for individuals involved, and for agencies called on to provide short- and long-term solutions; and second on current and future grant activity within the Foundation's International Affairs, Human Rights and Social Justice, and Urban Poverty programs. The paper shifts between broad international concerns, those of developing countries, and those of the United States. The growing Hispanization of the United States and pending immigration legislation are noted. Educational concerns mentioned include rights of refugee/migrant children to public education; tendency of recent refugee groups to have decreased levels of education; English as a second language; vocational education; problems of semiliterate and nonliterate refugees; and public education to promote understanding of cultural differences. Tables show 1982 world refugee statistics (total=10,032,400), 1981 ratios of refugees to local population for the top 20 countries, 7-year (1975-81) Indochinese refugee totals, and 1981 contributions to international refugee agencies by the top 20 countries. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED239818

Refugees and Migrants:
Problems and Program Responses

A look at the causes and consequences of today's major international population flows, and at the Ford Foundation's new programs to address the problems of refugees and migrants in the United States and elsewhere in the world.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol Ilts

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

RC014583

A working paper from the Ford Foundation

Refugees and Migrants: Problems and Program Responses

A working paper from the Ford Foundation

Preface 3

The Problem 5

The Population at Issue 5

Conflicts with Long-Term Residents 10

Responses to These Population Flows 12

Statuses, Rights, and Entitlements 16

Capacity of Major International, National, and Local Institutions to Cope with Population Flows 20

Access to Services 26

Program Responses 34

International Affairs 34

Human Rights and Social Justice 44

Urban Poverty 53

Conclusion 61

Additional copies of this report, as well as a list of other Foundation publications, may be obtained by writing to the Ford Foundation, Office of Reports, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, N.Y. 10017.

431 August 1983

PREFACE

Large scale population flows have repeatedly played key roles in human history and they continue to do so today. It is estimated that the number of refugees, migrants, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers worldwide exceeds 30 million. Ten million are generally recognized as refugees. Few regions of the modern world have been unaffected by these flows and many will derive both benefits and strains from continuing shifts of populations across national borders. These strains, while particularly sharp in the Third World, are also evident in industrialized nations and in the relations among neighboring countries and regions. Given the strong likelihood that these flows will continue, and given their unpredictability, the challenge facing public and private funders is to develop or strengthen response mechanisms flexible enough to address varied circumstances, self-conscious enough to draw lessons from past experience, and sufficiently robust to deal with large-scale crises. Such capacity is increasing around the world but is still underdeveloped and fragmented.

These concerns are not new to the Ford Foundation. In the early fifties the Foundation provided $3.8 million for assistance to Eastern European refugees in the United States and a like amount for those in Europe. In 1967, the problems of Palestinian refugees displaced by the Arab-Israeli war were the subject of $500,000 of grant activity. More recently, the needs of Indochinese refugees were addressed by a series of grants totaling nearly $1.9 million. The Foundation's concern for intellectuals and academics forced to flee repressive regimes has long been reflected in its work in human rights.

A 1980 paper by deputy vice president Francis X. Sutton urged that the Foundation consider the long-term problems of refugees and migration rather than respond to crises and marked the beginning of a shift in our approach to these matters. The present paper reflects a continuation and refinement of that shift, and the desire of Foundation staff to strengthen the capacity of key institutions and communities to cope with population flows over the long term.

The immensity of the problems of refugees and migrants requires us to define as sharply as possible the boundaries of our program interest. The Foundation's programs concentrate on flows of refugees and migrants across national borders, and do not attempt to deal with migration within countries. While Foundation support for urban and rural development programs in sending countries should help mitigate some factors contributing to population movement, such programs are not likely to have significant short-term impact on the refugee and migrant problem, and they are not discussed in this paper. The paper's focus is twofold: first, on the consequences of these flows for sending and receiving countries, for the individuals involved, and for the agencies that are called on to provide short- and long-term solutions; second, on current and future grant activity within the three Foundation programs now most actively engaged in the refugee and migration field: International Affairs, Human Rights and Social Justice, and Urban Poverty.

The paper shifts repeatedly, and deliberately, between broad international concerns, those of developing countries, and those of the United States. It gives special attention to the United States, where a significant portion of the Foundation's current activity is now concentrated, but it also notes the emergence and potential growth of activities in the Foundation's field office programs. Two aspects of the U.S. experience--the growing Hispanization of the country and the pending immigration legislation that may bring dramatic changes to the American scene--are noted but not fully developed. Those very significant topics are the subject of program explorations now under way concerned with Hispanic issues in the United States. Those explorations should be completed sometime in 1984.

When measured against the magnitude of the problem and the resources of intergovernmental, governmental, and church-affiliated funders, the Foundation's resources are limited: approximately $7.6 million allocated for refugee and migrant problems during the 1984-85 biennium. While we cannot and do not provide direct relief, we do seek to aim those limited resources at strategic targets where modest sums can produce significant change. Moreover, we hope that the way we use our funds will help other grantmakers, as well as international, national, and local agencies, decide how best to use theirs.

Several Foundation staff members contributed to this working paper, the principal authors of which were Paul Balaran (of the Foundation's International Affairs program staff), Diana L. Morris (of Human Rights and Social Justice), and Patricia K. Biggers (of Urban Poverty). Barry D. Gaberman, Peter F. Geithner, Enid C.B. Schoettle, Shepard L. Forman, and Bernard McDonald also made significant contributions.

William D. Carmichael
Vice President
Developing Country Programs

Susan V. Berresford
Vice President
U.S. and International Affairs Programs

THE PROBLEM

The Population at Issue

Today, as the world is increasingly aware, large numbers of people are leaving the homes, villages, cities, and countries where they were born and crossing national boundaries, often never to return. Many do so in search of economic opportunities not available at home, others primarily to escape oppression, civil strife, or natural disasters. These extensive population flows are not peculiar to the contemporary world. Throughout recorded history such movements have occurred, and given the enormous increase in the size of many national populations, the disparities between rich and poor nations, the conflicts between ethnic and national groups, and the impact of natural disasters, we can expect these flows to continue.

Persons crossing international borders may be refugees fleeing from political, ethnic, religious, or other persecution, labor migrants whose movements are determined by the availability of work, or somewhere in the broad and complex spectrum between. Most of this alien population can be classified into four general categories: (1) refugees--aliens who are generally recognized as having fled from persecution or civil strife; (2) migrants--alien workers, generally unskilled, and individuals seeking to join family members, whose presence in a given country may be legal, illegal, or undocumented; (3) asylum seekers--aliens whose refugee status has not been determined; (4) a group that falls into the grey area between these categories, safe-haven seekers--aliens seeking a temporary safe-haven from civil strife or natural disasters. In Africa those

seeking a safe-haven from civil strife are accorded protection under an expanded definition of refugees; in the United States and most other countries their status is determined on an ad hoc basis. The total population of refugees, migrants, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers is now thought to exceed 30 million worldwide.

Turning first to refugees, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers, it is important to keep in mind that while there have been several large-scale flows in the last few years from such regions or countries as Indochina, Afghanistan, Cuba, Haiti, Ethiopia, and Uganda, the current number worldwide, approximately 10 million (see Table I, on next page), is not the highest in recent memory. World War II, for example, produced some 22 million displaced persons. International attention during and immediately after that war, however, centered on population movements originating in Europe. Today, by contrast, more than 90 percent of the world's refugees, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers are found in the developing world, where the overwhelming majority of them will remain. Moreover, they are concentrated in the poorest of the developing countries. In recent years, two-thirds of the countries in the World Bank's lowest income category have been either sending or receiving countries for refugees.

The African situation deserves special comment. As many as 25 percent of the world's refugees, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers are in that continent. The actions of repressive regimes in countries such as Uganda and Equatorial Guinea, civil strife and other continuing conflicts in Angola, Zaire, the Horn of Africa, and Burundi, and racial oppression in South Africa have stimulated a series of major

Table I

1982 World Statistics

Africa

COUNTRY OF ASYLUM	NUMBER
ALGERIA Western Sahara, various	65,000
ANGOLA Zaire, Namibia, South Africa	73,000
BOTSWANA Angola, Namibia, South Africa	1,500
BURUNDI Rwanda	55,000
CAMEROON Chad	20,000
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC Chad	5,000
DJIBOUTI Ethiopia	30,000
EGYPT Various	5,500
ETHIOPIA Sudan	11,000
KENYA Ethiopia, Rwanda, Uganda, Various	3,900
LESOTHO South Africa, various	11,000
NIGERIA Chad	40,000
RWANDA Burundi, Uganda	10,000
SENEGAL Various	4,000
SOMALIA Ethiopia	700,000
SUDAN Ethiopia, Uganda, Chad, Zaire	500,000
SWAZILAND South Africa	5,700
TANZANIA Burundi, Zaire	156,000
UGANDA Rwanda, Zaire	113,000
ZAIRE Angola, Uganda, Zambia	370,000
ZAMBIA Angola, Namibia, various	42,000
OTHER COUNTRIES	30,000
Africa TOTAL	**2,251,600**

Asia

COUNTRY OF ASYLUM	NUMBER
AUSTRALIA Various	304,000
BHUTAN Tibet	1,500
CHINA Southeast Asia	265,000
HONG KONG Vietnam	14,000
INDIA Afghanistan, various	3,300
INDONESIA Vietnam	6,000
JAPAN Vietnam	1,800
LAOS Cambodia	3,800
MACAO Vietnam	1,200
MALAYSIA Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia	99,000
NEPAL Tibet	11,000
NEW ZEALAND Various	10,000
PAPUA NEW GUINEA Indonesia	1,000
PHILIPPINES Vietnam	6,600
SINGAPORE Vietnam	500
THAILAND Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia	193,000
VIETNAM Cambodia	33,000
Asia TOTAL	**954,700**

Europe

COUNTRY OF ASYLUM	NUMBER
AUSTRIA Eastern Europe	43,000
BELGIUM Various	33,000
DENMARK Various	1,800
FRANCE Various	150,000
GERMANY (FRG) Various	94,000
GREECE Various	3,800
ITALY Various	14,000
NETHERLANDS Various	12,000
NORWAY Various	6,000
PORTUGAL Africa, Latin America	7,600
ROMANIA Chile	1,000
SPAIN Latin America, Southeast Asia	40,000
SWEDEN Various	20,000
SWITZERLAND Various	37,000
UNITED KINGDOM Various	148,000
YUGOSLAVIA Various	2,000
Europe TOTAL	**613,200**

The World's Refugees

The Most Significant Refugee Situations

2.6 million from Afghanistan, in Pakistan
1.9 million Palestinians, in six areas
700,000 from Ethiopia, in Somalia
350,000 from Ethiopia, in Sudan
250,000 from El Salvador, in six countries
235,000 from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, in many areas

Latin America

COUNTRY OF ASYLUM	NUMBER
ARGENTINA Europe, Latin America, Southeast Asia	26,000
BELIZE El Salvador	7,000
BOLIVIA Europe, Latin America	500
BRAZIL Europe, Latin America	24,000
CHILE Europe	1,500
COLOMBIA Latin America	2,000
COSTA RICA El Salvador, Latin America	13,000
CUBA Latin America	3,000
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Haiti	3,800
ECUADOR Various	700
GUATEMALA El Salvador	50-100,000
HONDURAS El Salvador, Nicaragua (Miskito Indians), Guatemala	25,000
MEXICO El Salvador	70-140,000
NICARAGUA El Salvador	20,000
PANAMA El Salvador	1,000
PERU Europe, Latin America	1,500
URUGUAY Europe, Latin America	1,700
VENEZUELA Europe, Latin America	18,000
Latin America TOTAL	**268,700-388,700**

North America

COUNTRY OF ASYLUM	NUMBER
CANADA Various	338,000
U.S. Various	849,000
North America TOTAL	**1,187,000**

Middle East

COUNTRY OF ASYLUM	NUMBER
IRAN Afghanistan, Kurds, Iraq	110,000
LEBANON	3,200
PAKISTAN Afghanistan	2,600,000
PALESTINIAN REFUGEES	1,884,000
Jordan	733,000
West Bank	334,000
Ganza Strip	370,000
Lebanon	232,000
Syria	215,000
OTHER COUNTRIES	40,000
Middle East TOTAL	**4,637,200**

Refugee Totals

Africa	2,251,600
Asia	954,700
Europe	613,200
Latin America (high estimate)	388,700
Middle East	4,637,200
North America	1,187,000
TOTAL	**10,032,400**

Source: World Refugee Survey 1982

population flows. The principal asylum countries have been Somalia, the Sudan, Tanzania, and Zaire. Difficult economic conditions in many regions of the continent exacerbate the effects of this burden. Africa's 2.5 million refugees and asylum seekers have not attracted the degree of international attention associated with flows from Indochina or Afghanistan, and the level of per capita international assistance for them is the lowest in the world. This may be partially explained by the "invisibility" of Africa's many refugees and asylum seekers, who, while they cross national borders, tend to remain within the continent and to seek asylum among people with common tribal or ethnic backgrounds.

In the United States, the Refugee Act of 1980 incorporates the UN Convention definition of a refugee (see page 17), thereby amending U.S. law to establish a special status for refugees without geographic or ideological limitation. Under the act, greater numbers of aliens can qualify for admission to the United States as refugees than before. It established an annual limit of 50,000 for refugee admissions and requires the President to consult with Congress to allocate these admissions geographically and to set numbers beyond that limit. The pattern of refugee admissions in the United States has varied widely from a yearly low of 22,000 in 1977 to a high of 211,000 in 1980 (almost 168,000 of whom were Indochinese).* In 1982 the ceiling for refugee admissions was 140,000.

* In response to the arrival of 125,000 Cuban "expellees" between April 21 and October 10, 1980, a new category of temporary immigration status, "entrant: status pending," was created by the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS). This classification has been applied not only to these Cubans but also to the 35,000 Haitians who were known to INS as of October 10, 1980. These "entrants" would be included in the legalization program now before Congress.

Present-day migrants constitute an international labor flow unprecedented in magnitude and diversity. Migration for employment today encompasses a broad range of categories from individual illegal or undocumented migrants such as Mexicans who move across the U.S.-Mexican border, to workers from one country recruited, employed, and returned after participating in closely supervised projects in another. An example of the latter category is the participation of South Korean workers in construction projects in the Middle East.

Labor migration has become a dominant form of legal population movement. An underlying premise of the temporary and guest worker programs found extensively in Western Europe, the Middle East, and the United States is that labor can be imported and exported on a rotational basis with minimal impact on the social fabric of the receiving country. Since the mid-fifties, some 30 million guest workers have migrated to Western Europe, whose present guest worker population is approximately 14 million (including dependents). Migration for employment has long been a feature of Middle Eastern society, but the scale of movement increased markedly after the 1973 oil price rise. Although the number of labor migrants in the nine major oil-producing countries, three to four million, is much lower than the figure for Western Europe, these laborers are the largest component of the total labor force in many receiving countries.

Illegal migration has become an important phenomenon in all regions of the world. It constitutes the dominant form of migration in Latin America, where the traditional receiving countries have been

Venezuela (more than two million) and Argentina. Illegal migration among islands in the Caribbean is also widespread, as dramatically evidenced by the expulsion in 1981 of 25,000 illegal Haitians from the Bahamas. In Europe, 10 percent of the foreign workforce is thought to be illegal. Many African countries also have large numbers of aliens lacking formal authorization to live and/or work within their borders.

The country with the largest influx of illegal or undocumented workers is the United States, which now has an illegal population estimated at between 3.5 and 6 million people. Nearly all illegal migrants to the United States are from the Western Hemisphere, with more than half that flow arriving from Mexico.

Conflicts with Long-Term Residents

In recent years, much public attention in the United States has been drawn to the impact of aliens on local communities. As in past periods of major influx, there is a widespread belief that the country is being "overrun" by aliens, a perception, or misperception, reinforced by government statements that the United States has "lost control of its borders" and by well-publicized programs like "Operation Jobs," under which the INS arrested 5,440 illegal aliens who were working in the United States. In addition, there have been recurring, and sometimes exaggerated, media reports about hostilities between Vietnamese and local shrimpers in Texas, the criminal tendencies of Marielitos, and the burden that these and others impose on social services. A review of past experience with immigration

suggests that these attitudes are not unusual. Racism, xenophobia, and fear have often shaped immigration policy and the reception afforded to immigrants.

Similar perceptions and reports, reflecting a hostile popular attitude toward refugees and especially toward undocumented aliens, are also prevalent in other countries, including Germany, France, Britain, Nigeria, Lebanon, and India. Further, the high concentration of aliens in particular areas has aggravated the incipient xenophobia in many countries. As a result, public pressure to restrict alien rights and entitlements is increasing, and public willingness to welcome and assist even those persons who immigrate to escape persecution or to rejoin close family members is waning. Refugees are particularly vulnerable to reductions in their resettlement opportunities precisely because, as beneficiaries of government-run programs, they are a visible group.

Public understanding about the composition of resident alien populations is limited. Refugees and the special circumstances that give rise to their status are often not distinguished from migrants. The public knows little of the substandard treatment often afforded undocumented aliens or of their actual impact on working conditions, job displacement, wages, and public service utilization. Until basic studies are conducted on these matters and until the results of those studies are widely disseminated, it will be difficult to frame and gain acceptance for appropriate policies. Such studies should emanate from a community of respected independent scholars who can analyze the evidence on these questions and bring to bear the experience of a

variety of nations. Indeed, the sense of current conflict should be viewed in the context of the successful integration of past new populations and a recognition of the important contributions they have made.

Responses to These Population Flows

The categories of population flows mentioned above (refugees, migrants, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers) suggest tidier distinctions among groups than usually occur in reality; the forces that energize the flows are a topic of much debate. Whatever the factor or factors causing any particular population movement, it is certain that, in general, the conditions causing people to move will not soon disappear and that such flows as occur will include some of the world's more deprived and imperiled populations. The capacities of national governments and international agencies for dealing wisely and humanely with these international flows are growing but are still limited. The tensions such population movements produce, both within countries and internationally, remain serious. The success of nations in dealing with the consequences of immigration will play a large part in their economic, social, and political futures, and this is nowhere more true than in the United States.

Governmental and private agencies working with refugees and aliens seeking asylum or a safe-haven generally regard the temporary provision of essential care and maintenance as their primary mission. Once basic care has been provided, longer-term strategies must be considered. The long-term solutions that have traditionally followed initial emergency assistance are voluntary repatriation, local

integration in the country of asylum, and third-country resettlement--usually in the United States or in another of the industrialized nations.

There is serious concern that the first of these standard solutions, repatriation, may be increasingly impractical because of the nature of the strife that induces many of today's refugee flows. In Asia and Africa, for example, mass movements of refugees were once caused principally by struggles for independence against colonial rule; repatriation could usually be expected after the withdrawal of the colonial government. As colonial regimes are now nearly extinct, civil strife among competing domestic groups and warfare with neighboring states have emerged as the dominant causes of refugee flows. Instances of voluntary repatriation under these circumstances are not unknown. For most refugees, however, repatriation may take many years, during which time the refugees will remain dependent on assistance from the traditional international and national relief agencies.

The second standard solution, local integration or protracted residence in the country of first asylum, raises serious questions about the appropriateness of traditional forms of refugee assistance. The long-term presence of a large refugee population can strain an already fragile economy and can hamper the host country's development. Tensions may arise between indigenous and refugee populations competing for scarce living space, resources, and jobs. Should the goods and services provided to refugees by international

agencies rival or surpass those available to the indigenous population of the receiving areas, intense animosity of the latter toward the former may be provoked.

Finally, the last standard solution, third-country resettlement, is becoming increasingly impractical with regard to most Third World refugees (see Tables II and III, on page 15). It is reasonable to assume, for example, that neither the United States nor the other industrialized countries will ultimately become the permanent home for most of the three million Afghan refugees now living in Pakistan. Similarly, only a handful of Africa's 2.5 million refugees are likely to end up in one of the industrialized nations. No more than 150,000 refugees from the current total worldwide population of 10 million are expected to be resettled in industrialized countries in 1983. Economic difficulties in the developed world, heightened xenophobic tendencies resulting from the marked growth of both legal and illegal migrant populations, the high costs associated with resettlement, and the difficulty of integrating the uneducated and unskilled into an advanced industrial society all argue against the widespread use of this solution. Moreover, many refugees do not want to be permanently resettled in a third country.

Because of the problems resettlement in third countries poses in added expense and integration into radically different societies, it is an option that is likely to be exercised only under certain limited circumstances. A promise of resettlement in the First World may be necessary to preserve first-asylum rights in countries that are unwilling or unable to shoulder the economic or political burden of

Table II

1981 Ratio of Refugees to Local Population—Top 20 Countries

Country	Population (In Millions)	Refugees	Ratio of Refugees to Local Population	Gross National Product Per Capita
Somalia	3.8	700,000	1:5	$ 130
Jordan	3.3	733,000	1:5	1,180
Lebanon	3.2	235,200	1:14	1,030
Djibouti	.5	30,000	1:17	420
Belize	.2	7,000	1:29	1,030
Pakistan	88.9	2,600,000	1:34	270
Sudan	19.6	500,000	1:39	370
Syria	9.3	215,000	1:43	1,070
Australia	14.8	304,000	1:49	9,100
Burundi	4.2	55,000	1:76	180
Zaire	30.1	370,000	1:81	260
Angola	6.7	73,000	1:92	440
Swaziland	.6	5,700	1:105	650
Guatemala	7.5	50-100,000	1:113	1,020
Tanzania	19.2	156,000	1:123	270
Uganda	14.1	113,000	1:125	290
Nicaragua	2.5	20,000	1:125	660
Lesotho	1.4	11,000	1:127	340
Zambia	6.0	42,000	1:143	510
Malaysia	14.3	99,000	1:144	1,320

Table III

Seven-Year Indochinese Refugee Totals—Top 15 Countries, Ranked by Ratio of Refugees to Population—1975-81

Country	Population (In Millions)	7-Year Total of Indochinese	Ratio of Refugees to Population
Australia	14.8	59,400	1: 249
Canada	24.1	81,500	1: 296
U.S.	229.8	567,000	1: 405
France	53.7	83,600	1: 642
Switzerland	6.3	9,100	1: 692
New Zealand	3.2	4,200	1: 762
Norway	4.1	3,100	1: 1,323
Belgium	9.9	5,060	1: 1,980
Denmark	5.1	2,400	1: 2,125
Germany (FRG)	61.3	21,500	1: 2,851
Netherlands	14.2	4,800	1: 2,958
Sweden	8.3	2,500	1: 3,320
U.K.	55.9	16,000	1: 3,494
China	1,027.0	266,000	1: 3,860
Italy	57.0	3,000	1: 19,000

Total resettled in all countries 1,148,600

Source: World Refugee Survey 1982

providing for a sudden, large influx of refugees. Permanent resettlement in the First World may also be the fate of refugees who were prominent individuals in their societies. This solution may also continue to be employed in exceptional cases when historical, political, or military ties exist between the refugee population and a First World country. The Vietnamese refugees accepted into the United States after the fall of Saigon owe their resettlement to such ties.

The difficulties of applying the three standard solutions in an increasingly complex world suggest that durable solutions for refugees, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers will not be easy to achieve. Thus nations will need to increase their capacity to understand and to cope with these flows. Three problem areas seem particularly worthy of attention: the questions of rights, entitlements, and statuses; the institutional capacity for understanding and coping with population flows; and the development of effective service models that build self-sufficiency.

Statuses, Rights, and Entitlements

The millions of aliens who have forsaken their homeland constitute an extremely vulnerable population. They cannot count on receiving protection from the government of their home country. Instead, they must look to the international community, their own meager resources, and the hospitality of the host country--its government and its residents--to protect them until they are repatriated, integrated locally, or resettled in a third country. Often such assistance falls short of what is needed.

The international and domestic laws that protect refugees, asylum seekers, and migrants are limited in number and scope. An alien's motivation for emigrating--as perceived by the receiving country and by responsible international organizations--determines whether legal status and other protections will be forthcoming. The most numerous and the strongest alien protections articulated to date apply to refugees. Ninety-three countries, including the United States, are parties to the 1951 United Nations Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and/or to its 1967 Protocol extending the convention's substantive provisions to current refugees. (The convention and protocol are referred to hereafter, collectively, as the "UN Convention.") The UN Convention established the definition of "refugee" now accepted internationally:

> ...any person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself of the protection of that country, or who, not having a nationality and being outside the country of his former habitual residence, is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to return to it.

In addition, it lays out a "bill of rights" for those aliens recognized as refugees. Chief among the protections guaranteed to bona fide refugees is the right not to be subjected to refoulement (forcible repatriation) to a country of persecution.

When the UN Convention was drafted, most aliens seeking asylum in Western countries were fleeing persecution. More recently, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) considered the equally compelling protection needs of Africans fighting for independence and self-rule in, for example, South Africa, and the needs of other Africans

escaping the violence of civil wars and disorders in, for example, Ethiopia. Thus the OAU's 1969 Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of Refugee Problems in Africa also recognizes as refugees those aliens fleeing man-made, life-threatening circumstances other than persecution. The OAU Convention incorporates the protections contained in the UN Convention but expands its definition of a refugee to include:

> ...every person who, owing to external aggression, occupation, foreign domination, or events seriously disturbing public order in either part or the whole of his country of origin or nationality, is compelled to leave his place of habitual residence in order to seek refuge in another place outside his country of origin or nationality.

Forty-two African countries are party to this regional convention. While the OAU Convention was born out of political circumstances peculiar to Africa, its expanded definition of a refugee is increasingly of interest worldwide.

As noted above, the great majority of aliens are migrant workers and their dependents. As the recent expulsion of aliens from Nigeria made all too clear, migrants enjoy few meaningful protections. The International Labour Organization (ILO) has drawn up a number of conventions and resolutions that govern the treatment of contract migrant workers <u>legally</u> present in a foreign country. However, only one ILO convention and one ILO resolution enumerate protections for <u>undocumented</u> migrants. Generally, these instruments have had limited effect. Recognizing that migrant workers are denied many fundamental rights, the UN General Assembly established a working group to draft a convention that would clarify and stimulate implementation of the rights of migrant workers. The proposed

convention, entitled the International Convention on the Protection of All Migrant Workers and Their Families, contains a section listing the fundamental rights of all migrants, including the undocumented. Controversy about the scope of these rights, however, has hindered the progress of the working group.

Although the United States has not adopted any of the conventions put forward by the ILO to protect migrant workers, the constitutional rights to due process and equal protection are extended to all aliens who have entered the United States, regardless of the legality of their presence. For example, the Supreme Court recently held that children of undocumented workers have the right to attend public schools without paying an additional fee. Undocumented aliens, however, may experience other abuses and hardships, such as unscrupulous labor practices that deny minimum wage entitlements and that demand excessive hours of work, limited access to medical services, and inequitable housing arrangements.

These few international instruments, domestic laws, and constitutional guarantees compose the fragile structure on which protections for aliens now rest. It is on these documents that governments, international organizations, special interest groups, and aliens themselves base their efforts to secure fair and decent treatment for aliens. For an assortment of reasons ranging from inadequate clarification and implementation of existing statuses to failure to formulate additional rights, aliens, in the United States and elsewhere, are not adequately protected.

Capacity of Major International, National, and Local Institutions to Cope with Population Flows

The major international organization for dealing with refugees is the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The breadth of the UNHCR mandate and the quality and effectiveness of its work are of fundamental importance to the world's capacity to deal with refugee situations. This mandate is not limited to the temporary protection and assistance of refugees. The UNHCR regularly seeks to make possible the return of refugees to their home countries or their permanent resettlement elsewhere.

The acceptance of UNHCR as a necessary and permanent part of the UN apparatus now seems clear and uncontroversial. Its responsibilities have been expanded over the years to enable it to provide assistance to countries that may request it. This extension of "good offices" began in the fifties with assistance to Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Algerians in Tunisia, and led to a broad General Assembly Resolution in World Refugee Year, 1959, recognizing the need for UNHCR involvement in such relief activities. Whereas UNHCR originally processed refugees on a case-by-case basis, the mass flows of recent years have forced it in many instances to deal with sizable groups without making individual differentiations.

The UNHCR is subject to many pressures and does not escape vigorous criticism. It receives no regular budget allocation from the UN and must raise its funds by periodic direct appeals to its 157 member governments, of which more than 80 have responded. While the UNHCR, whose overall 1982 budget was in excess of $400 million, has

become more active in the recent past, it has generally avoided direct operational responsibilities for relief and resettlement activities. Instead, most of its funds flow to refugees through intermediary operating organizations. In many parts of the world this means that it depends on rather fragile and limited national capacities or on the cooperation of international voluntary organizations, many of which need strengthening.

The second most important intergovernmental organization involved in refugee matters is the Intergovernmental Committee for Migration (ICM). In contrast to UNHCR, ICM is primarily an operational agency, having as its major task the provision of international passage for refugees on chartered or regularly scheduled commercial flights. Nongovernmental organizations that also play an important role in refugee assistance include the International Committee of the Red Cross, the major church-related charitable and relief organizations, and a host of other organizations, often small but with dedication and value far beyond their tangible resources. Less constrained than governmental organizations by legal mandates, many of these organizations respond with strong charitable and humanitarian impulses and concern themselves with a broad range of aliens, many of whom are not, strictly speaking, refugees. The array of activities these organizations fund and carry out is extensive.

International coordination of the activities of nongovernmental and voluntary organizations concerned with refugees and migration is an aim of the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) in Geneva. This organization has a working group on refugees and

migration for coordination among the agencies and between them and the UNHCR and other UN organizations.

The various components of the international apparatus devoted to refugee matters exhibit certain readily identifiable strengths and weaknesses. UNHCR is unrivaled in terms of technical knowledge and experience relating to the practical aspects of protection and assistance for refugees. In addition, because of the respect accorded the high moral purpose of the organization, UNHCR is often able to negotiate directly with senior government officials to ensure acceptance of policy decisions without generating public controversy. The organization has also occasionally exhibited a formidable ability to raise large amounts of emergency funds. Because UNHCR is an intergovernmental organization, however, it is at times subject to conflicting pressures from governments. Moreover, its scope of activity is limited by the fact that it must await invitation by governments harboring refugees before it can intercede in a crisis. Like other organizations that deal repeatedly with crisis situations, UNHCR finds it difficult to do as much planning, research, and evaluation as it would like. Finally, although the linking of refugee assistance to economic development has become a matter of prime importance in the Third World, UNHCR does not at present have the experience or the clear mandate to respond adequately to the need for this new approach to refugee problems.

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), despite its involvement in many refugee activities, is principally concerned

with people affected by warfare and not refugees per se. ICRC therefore cannot respond to many types of refugee needs.

The nongovernmental organizations bring an invaluable flexibility to refugee emergencies. However, they represent a great variety of individual constituencies, which approach this subject with different motivations and expectations. As a result, the goals of the nongovernmental organizations at times may be in conflict. The differing outlooks of the voluntary agencies pose a challenge to an umbrella organization such as ICVA, which, with its limited resources, attempts to coordinate their activities and to harmonize their interests in order to achieve the maximum effect.

International organizations and voluntary agencies cannot become more effective without a similar improvement on the national government side. Greater capacity by national governments both to anticipate and to cope with crises involving refugees would facilitate the work of other agencies. This involves further emphasis on the responsibility of national governments, greater sensitivity to the potential for disasters and political turmoil, and greater capacity to coordinate and use existing public resources to cope with flows of refugees or migrants.

In the United States, the Office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs is charged with overseeing the various actors in the U.S. refugee program, principally the Departments of State, Health and Human Services (HHS), and Justice. The office, located within the State Department, is hindered in its oversight function by its lack of line and budgetary authority over agency programs. The three cabinet

departments with primary responsiblity for refugee affairs--State, HHS, and Justice--differ markedly in their roles and perspectives on refugee issues. The State Department takes as its primary responsibility reporting on refugee crises and providing support for relief abroad. It also has responsibility for the initial phases of resettlement, including placement decisions and the administration of cooperative "reception and placement" agreements. HHS's Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) currently channels $472 million worth of income and health-care assistance to refugees through the welfare system, attempting at the same time to ensure that states do not suffer undue hardship as a result of refugee resettlement. It is also disbursing social-service grant funds for language, employment, outreach, referral, and other services aimed at enhancing the prospects of refugees for economic self-sufficiency and social integration. The Justice Department, as of March 1983, assumed reponsibility through its Community Relations Service for ORR's program of reception, processing, and resettlement of Cuban and Haitian entrants. The Department also administers the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which is concerned with the enforcement of laws relating to the admission, exclusion, deportation, and naturalization of aliens, and which would be the lead agency in implementation of the legalization program now under consideration in the United States.

Since passage of the Refugee Act of 1980, state and local governments have played a more prominent role in refugee matters, as the act requires the formulation of state refugee plans and the

appointment of state coordinators. States currently perform three major functions: they administer refugee aid for ORR, monitor ORR social service grants, and absorb expenses for services not covered by refugee or other national programs. Local and state governments have become increasingly insistent about the national nature of the refugee program and the primacy of federal responsibility for it. At the same time, they voice their desire to become more involved in decisions about refugee placement and programming.

The oldest and possibly the most complicated role in the U.S. refugee system belongs to the voluntary agencies that operate the roughly one dozen refugee resettlement programs with which the Department enters into cooperative agreements. Since 1943, under the aegis of the New York City-based American Council of Voluntary Agencies for Foreign Service, Inc., these organizations have played an active part in resettling every major refugee wave in the postwar period; some have been serving immigrants for more than a century. One of the major questions related to proposed immigration reform concerns both the capabilities and appropriateness of voluntary agencies playing a major role in the implementation of a legalization program, since many of the clients they would be serving--through counseling, preliminary screening, and processing activities--are predominantly Spanish-speaking populations with which they have heretofore had limited contact.

The final actors to be considered in any discussion of the resettlement process are perhaps the most frequently overlooked: the refugees themselves. Evaluations of the current and potential roles

of refugees vary widely. Many refugees contend that established funding relationships, in which most money flows to government agencies and voluntary agencies, largely exclude them from formal participation in the system, and that the refugee voice is too rarely heard in discussions about optimal means of allocating resources for new arrivals. Voluntary agencies have been accused of paternalism and of resistance to working closely with refugee organizations. In some cases, however, refugee organizations take an active part in the adjustment process as workers and supervisors within voluntary agencies, as recipients of ORR social service grants, and/or as organizers of mutual assistance associations (MAAs). Communities of refugees perform a range of formal and informal social and economic services for their members, including economic development, orientation to a new setting, translation and interpretation, and sponsorship of cultural and religious activities. Most of the 300 legally incorporated MAAs have been formed by Indochinese even though, increasingly, other populations have begun to develop their own self-help organizations. Additionally, nationally-oriented service associations were formed in the late seventies by three of the five major Indochinese ethnic groups.

Access to Services

There have only been a few examples of what one researcher terms "a single-burst exodus" of refugees or migrants to the United States. Most ethnic groups have arrived through a series of flows, with each group projecting distinct background profiles and encountering diverse experiences in the United States. The pattern that has emerged for a

number of recent refugee groups--particularly the three numerically largest groups, the Cubans, Indochinese, and Soviet Jews--shows decreasing levels of education and of English-language competency.

A 1962 sample showed that 36 percent of the first wave of Cubans had twelve years or more of formal schooling (at a time when only 4 percent of the entire Cuban population did); by 1973, the figure had dropped to 22 percent, and the figure for the 1980 Mariel group was even lower. As is generally known, the "golden exiles" of the sixties were largely Cuba's professional and business class, while those arriving in the early seventies came from Cuba's working class. Studies of the Indochinese population have noted its change from the 1975 cohort of predominantly educated, urban, French- or English-speaking Vietnamese elite to more recent arrivals, mostly from agricultural backgrounds, with low levels of education, literacy, English-language proficiency, and occupational skills.

The more recent "non-elite" refugees and migrants confront many of the same problems that other low-income populations experience, but they frequently have additional handicaps stemming from linguistic and cultural differences and lack of awareness of community resources and how to gain access to them. In some cases, they also bring very distinctive problems, the most dramatic example of which is presented by the H'mong, nonliterate tribespeople from the hills of Laos who are accustomed to itinerant, swidden (slash-and-burn) agriculture and who come from a society based on a clan structure and acceptance of polygamous practices.

Whatever typical and atypical problems these groups present, one of the first challenges is to develop their abilities to be self-supporting. Unfortunately, many voluntary agencies in the United States have experienced difficulties in effectively linking their activities with employment programs. Even when those links are made, the limited ability of employment programs to work with non-English-speaking clients, the few training opportunities appropriate for newcomer populations, and the social and economic disincentives to employment all constrain the programs' effectiveness.

Two quite different employment approaches are espoused by those practitioners as they seek to fulfill the primary mandate of the refugee program--to enable refugees to achieve economic self-sufficiency as quickly as possible. In the first model, "front-end loading," the refugee is supported by public assistance while being provided with extensive English as a Second Language (ESL) training, at least some employment counseling, and sometimes vocational education. It is assumed that at the end of the training period, the refugee will be at least minimally able to compete in the labor market. However, comments are made that the time allotted for training is often insufficent to make newcomers competitive for decent jobs, the training is poorly designed, and the special help provided fuels backlash.

The other model is immediate placement of the refugee into any available job, on the assumption that prolonged exposure to public assistance will be "habit forming," that the fundamental need of refugees is for employer recommendations and work experience in the

United States, and that investment in language and/or vocational training is unlikely to produce more than an entry-level job for most refugees. This approach may lead to early engagement in work, but according to its critics it often results in limited language acquisition, dead-end, low-paying jobs, and serious disorientation.

Refugees also face disincentives to work that, while not peculiar to refugee populations, should not be underestimated. Given the above-average size of many refugee families, acceptance of AFDC or Refugee Cash Assistance benefits may be viewed as a necessary survival strategy when minimum-wage compensation for one (or even two) working family members does not cover basic household expenses. Finally, the disincentive to work can stem from the high status accorded to education by many refugees and from the resulting preference to remain in ESL or other classroom settings.

"Welfare dependency" is probably the single most controversial issue in the domestic resettlement program. A General Accounting Office report to the House Judiciary Committee found, in a 1983 study of highly impacted counties, that 71 percent of working-age refugees who had been in this country less than six months were receiving cash assistance. HHS, in surveying selected states in 1983, found a nationwide welfare-dependency rate of 67 percent for refugees here less than three years, compared to a 30 percent dependency rate in 1976. The Refugee Policy Group argues that part of this dramatic rise can be attributed to statistical and methodological variations rather than to an actual change in patterns of welfare use. They also note, however, the effect of the low educational levels of more recent

cohorts of refugees as well as the greater proportion of new arrivals in the overall refugee population. Another major issue--not specific to refugees but graver for them--is the link in many states between eligibility for receipt of cash and medical assistance. Since entitlement to subsidized medical services is dependent on eligibility for cash assistance, there is a strong incentive to enroll in various welfare programs.

The refugee program's single greatest investment of dollars and staff time has probably been directed to ESL instruction. The volume and in general the quality of services has been high because so much attention has been paid to materials development and teaching. Until an ORR "crackdown" a few years ago, moreover, program operators found it easier to provide ESL instruction than employment services.

Despite the presence of motivated and capable language service providers, at least two major problem areas currently exist. The first is that only relatively recently has significant attention been paid to employment-related language needs; the second is the lack of employment-counseling materials, particularly in the languages of countries of origin, that could be used by voluntary agencies and ESL classes. This second problem involves the lack of opportunities to meet and exchange experience and know-how among providers of services to "limited-English-proficient speakers" who work in different institutional settings (community colleges, school districts, vocational training projects, language institutes, and programs concerned with refugee resettlement or migrant "settling out"). There are several major consequences of this lack of coordination:

inefficient use of resources, since materials are developed on an ad hoc basis in programs across the country; "reinvention of the wheel" rather than refinement of previously developed materials; insufficient targeting by service providers of the most promising occupational areas for which clients should be prepared and oriented; and missed opportunities to consolidate public-sector funds in support of vocational and employment-related language programs for limited-English-speaking adults.

A major subset of language-related problems involves deficiencies in literacy, since a growing number of refugees and migrants in this country are functionally semiliterate (defined as having three to four years of formal education and/or minimal literacy skills). Two major categories of non-natives are doubly disadvantaged because of their linguistic background: non-Latin-alphabetic literates (Khmer, Lao, Chinese) and nonliterates (most H'mong and Mien and monolingual Creole-speaking Haitians). Even the most basic English as a Second Language class usually requires functional literacy, and courses that rely heavily on audio-lingual methods still must use written materials to reinforce orally introduced and practiced structures and vocabularies. A major philosophical debate over whether native- or second-language (English) literacy should be taught first has continued because assumptions about the benefits of native-language literacy instruction to subsequent training in English have not yet been tested systematically.

Even with limited English-language skills, some refugees and migrants with entrepreneurial talent get their first footholds by

starting small businesses. Others encounter barriers in this process and like other low-income entrepreneurs have insufficient capital, collateral, or equity necessary to secure commercial loans. Further, bankers are generally reluctant to handle loans that are small and procedurally complicated. Many refugees and migrants have limited or no established "track record" or credit history in the United States and often are unfamiliar with resources for technical assistance or loan packaging. Even when these obstacles are overcome, many struggling entrepreneurs cannot manage loans because interest rates are beyond their projected pay-back potential.

Although the scarcity of affordable housing units is a serious problem for all vulnerable groups, refugees and migrants often encounter added difficulties. The large size of many refugee families and their custom of including extended-family members or various nuclear families in one "household" conflicts in many cases with local housing codes and zoning ordinances. The limited contact of many refugees and migrants with the larger community also means that they may be unaware of their responsibilities as tenants and more vulnerable than others to consumer abuse and discrimination.

A final service issue relates to health. Despite the generally adequate refugee public health system and HHS's special attention to record development and forwarding in 1980, continuity of care--from overseas to domestic providers as well as in links between United States-based programs--is still an important consideration. This involves not only mechanical questions of competent linkage but also qualitative ones of information and education. Many of the problems

of uneven access to services faced by refugees in the United States are even more severe in migrant communities, particularly those with large numbers of undocumented workers and their families. Since they have no legal access to the screening/treatment system described above and lack access to the Medicaid system, this population is reluctant or unable to use existing public health facilities and hospitals; thus it underutilizes or inappropriately utilizes these facilities, by being forced to rely on emergency room services for non-acute situations. Use of borrowed Medicaid cards also complicates diagnosis and treatment. Maternal health care appears to be one area of particular concern for migrants; though there are few data on the question, public health officials have commented in particular on the implications for birth weight and infant health of mothers who receive little or no prenatal care.

PROGRAM RESPONSES

As noted earlier, three Foundation program areas--International Affairs, Human Rights and Social Justice, and Urban Poverty--have developed strategies to address the problems just described. Foundation staff based in New York and in the Foundation's field offices around the world expect to provide support for a wide range of activities within these three program areas. The following pages describe some recent and current grant-making activities.

International Affairs

The Foundation's concern for the international implications of refugee and migrant flows can be divided into three broad categories. The first of these is the establishment and support of independent institutions and programs around the world that can analyze a range of policy questions relating to population movements and contribute to decision making about them. The second category is the dissemination of information and the exchange of learning and experience on refugee and migration issues. The third category concerns the strengthening of the ability of international and regional agencies to respond to the problems caused by refugee and migrant flows.

Research and Policy Analysis. There is a strong case for sustaining an institutional capacity for policy research on refugee and migrant issues. An institution or program that concentrates on refugee and migration problems independent of any particular crisis can adopt a long-term, comprehensive perspective, one that can counteract the

common tendency to treat the recurrent, universal problem of population flows as isolated events. A permanent institution can also help fill fundamental information gaps that are obstacles to the formulation of sound policies. Finally, it can derive appropriate lessons from comparative analysis and identify trends over time.

In recognition of these needs, the Foundation made a grant in 1982 (with funds from the International Affairs, Human Rights and Social Justice, and Urban Poverty programs) for the establishment of the Washington, D.C.-based Refugee Policy Group (RPG), which will engage in policy research on domestic and international topics in the refugee field. RPG's goal is to take a long-range view of refugee issues and to maintain working ties with policy makers, operational agencies, and researchers. Domestically, RPG is devoting its efforts to policy studies of issues relating to refugee assistance programs and to the local impact of resettlement. In the international area, RPG is now concentrating on problems in developing countries, with particular attention to relief-centered programs and development projects designed to incorporate refugee populations.

Another aspect of this emphasis on strengthening the capacity of institutions to analyze the policy implications of population movements is the Foundation's support for university programs devoted to research on refugees and migration in particular geographic regions such as Mexico and the Caribbean. For example, the Foundation has supported projects at the New York University Center for Latin American and Caribbean Affairs, which specializes in migration research. A grant to the program on Caribbean migration at the

University of Florida, Gainesville, enables visiting professors and graduate students from the non-Spanish-speaking Caribbean to work on Caribbean migration issues. The Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies at the University of California, San Diego, has received funding for outreach and publications on migration. The Foundation recently made a grant to the Center for Border Studies in Tijuana, Mexico, whose research agenda includes, as a major item, the issue of Mexican migration to the United States. The Foundation also plans to explore the possibility of limited support for the introduction of courses and training programs in university centers on population movements. These courses and training programs should enhance understanding among students some of whom will eventually enter careers in policy, international affairs, or other activities related to refugee and migrant affairs.

The institutions and programs mentioned above will conduct research and policy analysis on several broad subjects. One is the identification of models for integrating refugees into ongoing development activities--an issue of immediate concern and debate within Third World asylum countries, First World donor countries, and such major international organizations as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the World Bank, and the OAU. Moreover, it promises to be a major topic at the second International Conference on Assistance to Refugees in Africa (ICARA II) in 1984, which will seek to raise funds and establish programs for African countries.

There is both a clear need for research of this kind and an audience eager to consider its results. In this regard, the

Foundation is supporting a study by Professor Barry Stein of Michigan State University that is examining the institutional impediments to moving from emergency aid in a refugee crisis to the implementation of a development program for the refugees. Professor Stein's project--which is being carried out at the RPG--will focus on the goals, programs, operating procedures, and funding methods of organizations that specialize in refugee assistance and those that concentrate principally on development matters. He will present specific recommendations for improved coordination of efforts to provide long-term assistance to refugees within the context of the development plans of the asylum country. The Foundation is also supporting the American Council of Voluntary Agencies (ACVA) to enable a joint African-American research committee, composed of researchers from the United States, Somalia, and Ethiopia, to conduct fieldwork to improve the design and implementation of post-emergency rehabilitation projects for refugees in Somalia. The Foundation's Cairo office, along with funds from USAID, UNHCR, and European funding agencies, recently enabled the Sudanese Commissioner for Refugees to convene a seminar on issues connected with refugee settlement in the Sudan.

A second important research area is the search for ways to lessen the destabilizing political and economic impact of refugee flows on such first-asylum countries as Pakistan, Thailand, the Sudan, and Somalia, and on the international system generally. In late 1982, the Foundation made a grant to Louis and Nancy Dupree for a survey of the conditions experienced by the large Afghan refugee population in Pakistan and the impact of those refugees on the indigenous

population. The work of the Duprees should yield specific recommendations to operational agencies working in Pakistan to improve programs for refugees.

The Foundation also provided funding in late 1982 for a conference on Kampuchea (Cambodia) that examined, among other critical issues, the Khmer refugee problem and Thailand's role as a first-asylum country. Several authorities on Khmer refugees, including the former UNHCR coordinator for Southeast Asia, the former head of the Khmer Emergency Group in the State Department, and the former director of the International Rescue Committee's operations for Thailand, presented papers at this meeting. The conference was designed to help keep intact the small community of serious analysts interested in the present conditions in Cambodia and the continuing refugee situation on the border of and within Thailand.

A third topic is the special consequences for women of refugee and migrant flows. Refugee camps often exhibit disproportionately high percentages of women and children. Moreover, the strictures of camp existence pose special problems for women. The Duprees' project will focus particular attention on the effects on Afghan women of prolonged stays in tent villages in Pakistan. Additionally, many labor migrant flows consist primarily of male workers, with the result that the sending areas often have an unusually high incidence of female-headed households. Examples of population movements that are overwhelmingly female have been observed. These topics need to be better understood.

A fourth research area concerns the fundamental causes of refugee flows in different regions of the world and the relationship between these causes and the characteristics of the refugee movements. The Foundation has made a grant to a team of scholars to identify and analyze in a comprehensive manner salient features of major refugee flows in the Third World since 1960, and the effectiveness of strategies of response. The object of this work would be to provide a sounder basis with which to assess likely trends and potential demands that may be made on the United States. The Office of the U.S. Coordinator for Refugee Affairs is required to assess refugee trends annually as part of the process of determining U.S. refugee policy towards admissions. The findings of the study, which would be disseminated through briefings for the appropriate government officials, would likely be a valuable alternative source of information to complement the present fragmented data used for the government's assessments.

A fifth research topic concerns the economic, demographic, and social consequences of migration for sending countries, an issue that, because attention has centered on the effects on receiving countries, has been relatively neglected. Many questions remain about the ultimate costs and benefits of these flows, as do marked differences of opinion among researchers in this area. The Foundation is providing a grant to the East-West Center, in Hawaii, for a conference of migration specialists and government policy makers from five Asian countries that are a source of labor to the Middle East. This conference will examine the impact of labor migration on the family

and social structure of sending countries and will explore the policy options available to governments to mitigate some of the less desirable consequences of emigration. The Foundation's Cairo office, through grants to the Population Council's MEAWARDS research program, has supported analysis of the socioeconomic impact of migration in sending countries such as Egypt, the Sudan, Lebanon, and Jordan, and another research project on selected aspects of the effect of labor migration on Middle Eastern sending countries is also under consideration. The Foundation is reviewing a proposal to support a conference on the interaction between migration and development in the Caribbean Basin with special emphasis on the consequences for the sending countries. The conference will attempt to translate the voluminous scholarly material on this subject into specific policy recommendations for the United States and the Caribbean countries. The Foundation intends to promote comparative research projects that will cut across regional lines and enable specialists and government officials to learn from conditions in different parts of the world.

The last topic on our research and policy analysis agenda is the role of migration in the foreign policy of the United States and other receiving countries. In an attempt to encourage greater attention in the general decision-making process to matters of foreign policy, the Foundation will support research projects that articulate in a concrete way the relationship between these two areas.

Public Education and Dissemination of Information. The challenge to funders in supporting research across such a broad spectrum is, first, to select topics on which the policy community seeks guidance and,

second, to make a body of useful knowledge available to interested groups around the world. Given this emphasis on policy relevance and communication with a broad audience, the Foundation is committed to the effective dissemination of research findings both within and beyond the community of specialists, and to developing channels among different constituencies involved in refugee and migration matters. The requirements of such diverse groups as researchers, agency personnel, fieldworkers, government officials, and the concerned public can be addressed with modest support to specialized publications, data-based projects on population movements, and organizations that can channel information to a broad range of groups associated with refugee and migration issues. The Foundation is currently reviewing requests for support from several publications that specialize in refugee and migrant issues.

The profusion of literature on refugee matters in recent years has increased the need for the establishment of a central clearinghouse. Moreover, refugee work is severely handicapped by the abundance of relevant field experience that has not been "translated" into an accessible format for other practitioners. A Foundation grant to the Geneva-based International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA), an association of national and international voluntary agencies concerned with the promotion of human welfare, partially supports the newly created International Refugee Integration Resource Center (IRIRC), a joint undertaking of UNHCR, ICM, and ICVA. IRIRC is a computerized information center charged with responsibility to gather, store, and disseminate data on all aspects of refugee programs

and practices. It publishes Refugee Abstracts and plans to issue a comprehensive directory of refugee agencies and a listing of refugee experts. The Refugee Policy Group will also be establishing in the United States a repository of material on refugee matters.

The Foundation will also support selected organizations able to encourage the exchange of information and ideas on refugee and migration policies and practices among interested parties. For example, in fiscal year 1983 a grant--made jointly by the International Affairs, Human Rights and Social Justice, and Urban Poverty programs--went to the National Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Forum, which has as its principal objective the promotion of communication networks and working relationships among its affiliated organizations in the United States. The forum's membership is composed of religious, ethnic, business, labor, and voluntary service organizations, as well as state and local governments.

Strengthening Institutional Capacity. The third major focus of the International Affairs program on refugees and migration is strengthening the capacity of public and private international agencies to respond to population flows. The Foundation has sought to identify and assist those groups that can increase cooperation and rational division of roles within the array of international refugee organizations that deliver assistance to refugees. As the number of organizations involved and the types of services provided have expanded dramatically in recent years, coordination and communication have taken on critical importance. Moreover, because the refugee situation is constantly changing and presenting new challenges to the

international organizations, it is important that they develop the capacity to adapt to new situations.

To this end, the Foundation supports ICVA's efforts to heighten the awareness by the many agencies of new refugee crises, to improve the effectiveness of those agencies in the Third World, and to coordinate their efforts with those of the UNHCR and the refugee departments of governments. ICVA regularly serves as the representative of the agencies in consultations with UNHCR, other UN bodies, and regional organizations like the OAU on such matters as a development approach to refugee problems. Another important facet of ICVA's work is the compilation of compendia of relief agencies in different regions of the world. The Foundation's field offices have also provided funding to UNHCR to enable it to hire consultants to design programs that would improve that organization's ability to deal effectively with refugees in a particular country.

The Foundation's Cairo office plans to assist the Office of the Sudanese Commissioner for Refugees in enhancing its capacity to plan long-term development through staff training, short courses, and special workshops. The Foundation's Nairobi office has worked in this broad area through a grant to the International Disaster Institute for a study of a select number of African refugee situations; the study should yield recommendations for ways to enhance the capacity of agencies and governments to cope with these events. Another example of the Foundation's work to strengthen institutional capacity is a current grant to the International Committee of the Red Cross for training programs designed to enhance the ability of its overseas

delegates to work with refugees. The grant enables experienced delegates to share their knowledge of refugee matters with newer delegates. It also provides for the training of outside experts on the legal, administrative, and service-delivery aspects of refugee crises.

The Foundation remains alert to other opportunities to improve the effectiveness and flexibility of the appropriate international and national organizations. For example, there is a pressing need for increased coordination among the nongovernmental organizations active in providing scholarships for African refugees, and between them and the relevant intergovernmental organizations. The Foundation will seek to identify and support an appropriate organization that could perform this vital function of improving cooperation among the many participants in this area.

Human Rights and Social Justice

As noted above, questions of rights, statuses, entitlements, and enforcement of existing protections require long-term attention. The staff of the Foundation's Human Rights and Social Justice program expect to support three types of work: research and policy analysis; public education and dissemination of information; and advocacy and litigation. These activities will be designed to clarify the statuses, rights, and entitlements of refugees and migrants today, to help assure that the existing rights and entitlements of these groups are protected, to develop such new definitions and protections as may be needed now and in the future, and to encourage mutual understanding among various ethnic and cultural groups.

Research and Policy Analysis. To help lay the groundwork for future public debate and policy, the Human Rights and Social Justice program plans to support research on topics ranging from international protection to methods of local conflict resolution. Studies will be conducted by policy research organizations described earlier in this paper and by individuals and organizations not yet designated as grantees. Program staff have organized the research agenda into five categories: refugees; mass influxes of aliens; migrants; unaccompanied minors; and the relations of new arrivals with citizens and long-term residents.

--Foundation work relating to refugees will include support of efforts to document the extent to which guaranteed protections have been or are being implemented in particular refugee situations. The Foundation will also encourage legal analyses of conventional refugee protections--studies, for example, of the extent to which states may curtail a refugee's freedom of movement. Other studies will seek to identify new protections needed--for example, protection from military and paramilitary intrusions. Where appropriate, field offices will fund projects to identify and document traditional antecedents of international refugee law--for example, Muslim law in the Sudan and Somalia--to affirm the legitimacy of international law. Additionally, given the recent and proposed revisions of asylum procedures in many countries, comparative research on current practices in selected countries would be useful in determining what procedures most

effectively differentiate between frivolous and legitimate claims. Such research could build upon a currently funded study on the evolution of United States admissions policy for asylum seekers.

--In the context of mass influxes of aliens, the program is promoting research analyzing and making recommendations about the adequacy of existing statuses under international law, the options available for providing protection to mass flows of aliens seeking asylum or a safe-haven, the legality and effect of detention policies, the desirability of temporary statuses, the responsibilities of countries of first asylum (including the United States), and the feasibility of regional cooperation to ensure minimum standards of protection. A study, funded by the Foundation and directed by Victor H. Palmieri, on the 1980 exodus of Cubans to the United States begins to address some of these questions, but further examination is needed.

--Within the category of migrants, little research has been done to identify the protection needs of undocumented workers, authorized migrant workers, and the families of both. The Foundation will therefore support examinations of these needs in light of existing constitutional and international law and the efforts of international organizations, such as the ILO, to secure additional protections. Where appropriate, support will be provided for case studies that examine the everyday experiences of undocumented migrants and that suggest areas where additional protections might be appropriate. For example, the Foundation's Cairo office recently provided support for an examination of the status of undocumented aliens in Lebanon and of problems relating to their detention. The

Foundation will also support research on the desirability and proper implementation of the legalization program currently proposed by members of Congress for certain undocumented aliens in the United States. The Foundation recently funded a study of the current legalization program in the United States Virgin Islands to derive lessons for the broader legalization program Congress may adopt. In addition, support is planned for research that examines the ramifications of an employer sanctions program.

--Groups of refugees, asylum seekers, aliens seeking a safe-haven, and migrants include an especially high-risk group, unaccompanied minors. Regardless of their legal status or of the causes accounting for their presence in a receiving country, unaccompanied minors are particularly vulnerable to psychological, medical, educational, and cultural problems and particularly unable to cope with those problems unassisted. To help determine the special protection needs of unaccompanied minors and to evaluate the competing interests of governments and private organizations, assistance is projected for research on the experiences and problems of unaccompanied minors in emergency situations. Grantees will be encouraged to recommend a set of international guidelines and to submit them to governments, to appropriate agencies of the United Nations, and to nongovernmental organizations. It is hoped that the resulting consideration of the guidelines will evolve into the development of formal agreements.

--As to the relations of new arrivals with citizens and long-term residents, research will be aided on the perceptions,

prejudices, and realities that give rise to ethnic conflict. Where appropriate, grantees will include members of the groups in conflict. Findings will be effectively disseminated and efforts made to ensure that research stimulates the design of programs that address interethnic conflict. In addition, attention will be focused on appropriate means to reduce the hostility between newcomers and long-term residents and citizens. As in the case of the recent, bloody conflict in India between Assamese citizens and Bengali-speaking immigrants, it is often difficult to determine whether hostility is caused by religious or ethnic intolerance, by the fear that one's cultural integrity is being irreversibly violated, or by competing political and economic claims. To untangle the dynamics involved, case studies that examine problems and successes in acculturating new immigrants in particular localities will be supported. In addition, research on the effect of alien populations on other minority groups--for example, of recent West Indian immigrants on American blacks--will be supported. Building upon a study, currently funded by the Foundation, on the future of pluralism in America, funds may also be made available for research that analyzes the significance of large ethnic enclaves where, for more than one generation, English has not been the primary spoken language.

Public Education and Dissemination of Information. The dissemination of balanced information on refugees and migrants could result in broader public understanding of the need for protections and programs on their behalf. The Foundation will pursue this goal through a number of activities, including support for publications, for seminars

and training conferences, for ethnic coalitions, and for public forums. Many of these will involve small grant actions, a few illustrations of which follow.

The program will support publications that inform both aliens and the general public about the problems, circumstances, motivations, and rights of aliens as well as of the opportunities available to them. Aliens themselves need information about the legal and political systems in the United States and the rights and entitlements available to them--information that governments often fail to provide for fear of attracting too many applicants. Foundation assistance will also help develop and disseminate educational materials that address commonly held misperceptions. The materials could serve as a basis for constructive discussions of the consequences of immigration for a particular community. In coordination with staff of the Foundation's Education and Culture program, Human Rights and Social Justice program staff also plan to explore opportunities to develop materials on the history and current role of ethnicity in the United States for schoolchildren who today may include illegal aliens, children of illegal aliens, and refugees.

Foundation funds are also earmarked for seminars and conferences on a number of subjects where training and serious discussion are warranted. Certain key alien-rights issues are identical or quite similar to rights questions of importance to other constituencies--for example, the importance of establishing or preserving the court's jurisdiction over civil rights matters. To broaden the base of organizations and of individuals knowledgeable

about alien rights, including minority groups that often see refugees and migrants as competitors, seminars that bring such similarities to light will be aided. Funding will also be provided for seminars that bring together academics, policy makers, and advocates to discuss available data on the relations of new arrivals with citizens and long-term residents. To encourage the implementation of existing international law, staff in New York and in the field offices plan to support training conferences for government officials and voluntary agency staff who need to be well-informed about refugee law, other alien rights, and relevant administrative procedures. As government officials are often reluctant to discuss alien rights in a highly visible setting, small conferences including international agency personnel will be supported to foster greater understanding and implementation of alien rights.

Where appropriate, coalitions established by particular ethnic or cultural groups will be aided so that such groups can more effectively represent their interests and describe the factors prompting their emigration to the United States. Such coalitions enable ethnic or cultural groups to respond more effectively to statements that incorrectly portray their circumstances and to actions that limit the exercise of their rights. For example, while the Foundation's aim in funding the Haitian Refugee Center was primarily to support its legal service activities, that organization has also served as a focal point for a highly fragmented ethnic group. In the latter capacity, the center has responded quickly to events that affect Haitians generally, such as the physical conditions under which

Haitians were detained by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. As evidenced by some of the mutual assistance associations formed by Indochinese groups, the coalitions may also help preserve the cultural identity of newcomers and may become an important source of information about the group's history, culture, and contributions to the receiving country.

As full debate on immigration issues requires the participation of experts from a broad spectrum of disciplines and special interests, the Foundation will contribute to appropriate public forums. Staff hope to support workshops and organizations that, like the National Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Forum, air diverse views on immigration issues, encourage consensus, where possible, among special interest groups, improve the quality of information available to policy makers, and help generate innovative responses to difficult immigration problems. Finally, to improve the administration of the proposed legalization program for undocumented aliens in the United States, the Foundation will consider support for mediation and education activities to enhance local cooperation among governments and voluntary agencies, ethnic organizations, lawyers, and labor unions.

Advocacy and Litigation. Aliens are often denied the basic rights of due process and equal protection guaranteed by the Constitution to all persons within the United States. Accordingly, the Foundation is aiding public law and advocacy groups, such as the Haitian Refugee Center and the affiliates of the American Civil Liberties Union, that are working to clarify and preserve due process and equal protection

for the alien, particularly in reference to practices and procedures relating to asylum, deportation and exclusion, and enforcement. Support is extended to legal scholars, lawyers, and human rights groups for the development of minimum standards of treatment of apprehended undocumented aliens and asylum seekers pending determination of their status, including guidelines for prolonged detention. Funding may also be provided for studies that evaluate proposed legislation affecting the rights of aliens (for example, The Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1983), that recommend alternative options where necessary, and that report on the application of enacted provisions.

Although the Immigration and Naturalization Service is a crucial component in the successful safeguarding of alien rights, its policies and procedures receive, for the most part, little public scrutiny. In addition, the population affected by those policies and procedures is disenfranchised and lacking in effective representation. More generally, immigration decisions made by the executive and legislative branches of government are often made without full consideration of protection needs or constitutional and international guarantees. To help remedy this lack of accountability, the Foundation will support efforts to monitor the activities of the executive and legislative branches that relate to refugees and migrants and subject them, where necessary, to judicial scrutiny. Human rights organizations such as the Lawyers Committee for International Human Rights will also be encouraged to relate

government treatment of aliens to international protection norms and to subject government practices to international scrutiny where substandard treatment may have occurred.

As part of our international human rights program, support will also be provided for the development of balanced information about human rights conditions in countries of origin. Such information will be disseminated to lawyers representing asylum seekers, government officials, and the general public. Along this line, the Foundation's Mexico City office recently funded a human rights bulletin that will research and report human rights violations and the situation of refugees in Central America. In light of current restrictions in the United States on the provision of federally funded legal services to most aliens, aid is projected for efforts that seek to expand the network of lawyers willing to provide pro bono services to indigent aliens in asylum, deportation, and exclusion hearings. To ensure the competence of these lawyers, training materials and model documents are being developed and disseminated with Foundation support. In addition, staff will investigate the potential for using trained paralegals to increase the legal services available to address immigration matters.

Urban Poverty

The Urban Poverty program's work on refugees and migrants is organized under four broad categories: (1) strengthening institutional capacity; (2) enhancing economic self-sufficiency; (3) public education and dissemination of information; and (4) research and policy analysis.

Strengthening Institutional Capacity. As noted earlier, refugee and migrant groups have proven capacities for self-help and mutual assistance. The Foundation seeks to help strengthen these capacities by reinforcing the efforts of these groups to organize and to integrate into their communities and by linking refugee and migrant groups to resources in their communities. In reviewing proposed self-help projects, Foundation staff will stress the importance of multiethnic models providing service on a significant scale in impacted areas, the need to attain a diversified funding base, and the use of Foundation support to provide leverage in that effort.

The Foundation has made two grants for projects of national scope. The Indochina Refugee Action Center (IRAC) has the potential not only to assist local communities from a national base, but also to become a national voice for the Indochinese population in the United States. This center, which represents the interests of the five Indochinese ethnic groups (the Vietnamese, Lao, H'mong, Cambodian, and ethnic Chinese), recently merged with the Council of Southeast Asian Refugees. IRAC has received substantial Foundation support since it was founded in 1979. A small Foundation grant has provided transitional support for this major organizational restructuring. IRAC's leadership is seeking to involve non-Indochinese groups that have not participated in traditional refugee resettlement operations but that have been successfully organized. Thus it has built an unusual board of directors bringing together Indochinese leadership in the United States with members representing the National Urban League, the National Council of La Raza, and the United Way.

The Refugee Women's Program Development and Coordination Project of the League of Women Voter's Overseas Education Fund (OEF) also assists a variety of local communities (OEF's project was granted partial core support for fiscal years 1983 and 1984). Initially intended to serve Indochinese women, the project now works with women of diverse national origins and immigration statuses. The project is the only nationwide effort to assist local groups in addressing the needs of women resettled in this country and to provide those responsible for refugee programs and policies with pertinent information about newcomer women's issues.

Enhancing Economic Self-Sufficiency. Earlier sections of this paper described some of the difficulties refugees experience in achieving economic self-sufficiency. Recent studies show that more than 60 percent of the U.S. refugee population receive cash assistance and most of the employed refugees work many more hours per week than other U.S. workers. Few self-employed newcomers, moreover, have managed to obtain either direct or SBA-guaranteed bank loans.

An early Foundation initiative will involve the creation of revolving loan funds in three cities with high concentrations of refugee/migrant entrepreneurs unable to obtain credit and with a community-based organization competent and appropriate to handle fund administration. It is anticipated that organizations initially chosen to administer revolving loan funds will receive both program-related investment (PRI) and grant support from the Foundation and will participate in an evaluation conducted by a nationally-based organization to measure the local impact of the funds and the

desirability of creating similar funds in other cities with significant numbers of refugee and migrant entrepreneurs. The directors of the projects will be brought together, before fund operations commence, to receive special training and will reconvene at periodic intervals to share information and receive supplementary training.

From past Foundation work domestically in community development and minority entrepreneurship, it is clear that economic development projects need to have available to them information and assistance as they seek to resolve inevitable technical difficulties. The Foundation will support a series of workshops convening key staff of relevant refugee and migrant projects, individuals experienced in creating enterprises and in organizing small-scale cooperative ventures, and members of different ethnic groups interested in working on common problems. Two sets of workshops are planned initially. The first will concern craft and textile businesses and will target newcomer women identified by the Refugee Women's Program Development and Coordination Project. Another workshop will bring together the planners of various H'mong farming cooperatives, experts in small-scale farm management and marketing, agricultural economics, and agricultural extension activities, and others experienced in organizing cooperatives for non-native workers.

As discussed previously, the transition of refugees and migrants from dependency to self-sufficiency is complicated by a variety of other factors: the relatively restricted availability of mainstream training opportunities for refugee and migrants; the lack

of legal status for some migrants; educational and language deficits of refugees and migrants; the uneven coordination of language training and employment; limitations of employment service programs; and disincentives to work built into the public-assistance system. Thus, another role for Ford funding will be to test ways of increasing the employability of newcomers, with the hope that such demonstrations will influence both governmental and private funding in high-impact areas. The first strategy concerns the "door-opening" stage of services--locating appropriate job openings and improving hiring practices. The second strategy addresses training needs and performance problems on the worksite.

The Foundation's Cairo field office has undertaken an initiative that parallels some of the strategies planned for the United States. In the Sudan, it has provided start-up support for Euro Action-ACORD (EAA), a London-based consortium of seventeen European and Canadian private development-assistance organizations. An initial feasibility study on the prospects for establishing small cooperative industries, a revolving loan fund, and apprenticeship programs for refugees in Port Sudan proved encouraging. It will now be followed by a two-year effort to develop an integrated program of support for small-scale industries.

As noted previously, the lack of contact among service providers in many communities and, nationwide, across various professional networks has important consequences for the system of delivering services to limited-English-speaking adults. Efforts to develop teaching materials are both fragmented and redundant. Because

so many different actors and institutional settings are involved, no one is responsible for evaluating the overall effectiveness of the system. There is virtually no targeting of key occupational areas or industries that may be hiring, nor is there any effort to develop language-training materials. And, finally, funds from vocational and adult education and from refugee program budgets remain uncoordinated and opportunities to leverage these funds or use them creatively are often lost.

In recognition of these problems, Foundation staff have convened informal advisory committees composed of knowledgeable representatives from community colleges, school districts, vocational training and employment projects, and refugee resettlement and migrant "settling out" programs in a few heavily impacted states. These advisory committees, when formalized, will identify the industries that appear to have the greatest potential to hire and train limited-English-proficient adults, and will devise strategies to prepare clients for entry into those industries and to encourage employers to train and/or hire those clients. A project director will be responsible for the implementation and coordination of these activities, for documenting the experience in materials useful to other program operators, and for a continuing exchange of information and ideas with the counterpart project directors in the other two states. To enhance "door-opening" possibilities with industry and to garner financial support for the strategies (stipended on-site vocational ESL classes) that cannot be funded through the modest Foundation grant, each advisory committee will soon form a statewide

consortium that will include high-ranking representatives from the private sector, from state and local funding sources, and from policy-making departments.

Committee members and others consulted in the field express strong enthusiasm for this effort to consolidate resources and ideas of representatives from a variety of professional sectors for whom no common forum currently exists. They share the belief of Foundation staff that a focus on employment and related language programs for a limited number of industries can yield larger and more tangible results than can current uncoordinated and "scatter-shot" efforts. If successful, this basic approach would be tested in other states having outstanding service providers and high concentrations of limited-English-proficient adults.

Closely tied to these demonstration job preparation and language instruction projects will be the Foundation's funding of selected literacy projects. As is the case with the Urban Poverty program's work in the employment and training area, attention to literacy derives from a recognition of the link between literacy and employability. Foundation staff are studying ways to provide non-native speakers with literacy materials especially designed for their use. Few such materials now exist, and materials designed for native speakers are generally recognized as inappropriate for non-native use.

Research and Policy Analysis, Public Education and Dissemination of Information. As discussed above, the Urban Poverty, Human Rights and Social Justice, and International Affairs programs have collaborated

in funding two major Washington-based national policy discussion organizations: the Refugee Policy Group and the National Immigration, Refugee and Citizenship Forum. The functions of the two organizations are complementary; the forum focuses on frequent information sharing among diverse sets of constituencies, while the Refugee Policy Group concentrates on longer-term research questions related to refugee resettlement.

Two key questions related to Urban Poverty program interests are likely to figure prominently on the Foundation's research agenda in the coming years. The first concerns the impact on the regional labor market of refugee and migrant workers. Funding is contemplated for projects addressing two related issues: the roles and effects of ethnic enclave economies (for example, that of Miami) in absorbing newcomer workers, and job displacement and wage depression in the secondary labor market caused by undocumented Mexicans. The second research topic is the impact of the proposed federal legalization program on Spanish-speaking migrants. If legislation passes, a number of questions would need to be addressed, including protection and public education, the capacity of existing programs to address the needs of a potentially large number of new clients, and the program networks that would need to be established or strengthened in the service delivery system. Staff in the Urban Poverty and Human Rights and Social Justice programs will together review proposals and monitor developments in the field; however, major Foundation exploration of specific project possibilities in this area must await the outcome of the legislative process in Washington and the form of the legalization program ultimately approved.

CONCLUSION

This paper's point of departure is that the current worldwide population of refugees, migrants, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers is neither historically unique nor likely to abate in the near future. Moreover, the continuing flows will include some of the world's more deprived and imperiled populations. The Foundation is already working on a number of fronts that will, at least indirectly, affect these flows. For example, our work on agricultural productivity, on the more effective management of land and water resources, and on rural development generally should contribute, by improving the quality of rural life, to a lessening of the factors that encourage migration. However, the worldwide magnitude and the individual circumstances of this population of aliens argue for increased activity--by the Ford Foundation and by others--specifically on behalf of refugees and migrants. Such activity is consistent with some of the more general aims of the Foundation: to improve the status of and opportunities for disadvantaged populations, to diminish international tensions, and to reduce inter-ethnic conflict.

But, as was noted earlier, the need far outstrips the dollars available from both public and private sources. Tables IV and V, on pages 62 and 63, give some sense of the scale of resources allocated to refugee aid agencies by the governments of the twenty largest-donor countries. If one were to subtract from those statistics the amounts spent for temporary provision of essential care and maintenance to refugees, asylum seekers, and safe-haven seekers, the funding would drop significantly.

Table IV

1981 Contributions to International Refugee Aid Agencies
Top 20 Countries, Ranked by Total Contribution

Country	Contributions* (In Millions)
U.S.	$338.9
Japan	63.1
Saudi Arabia	37.2
Germany (FRG)	36.4
Australia	33.5
Sweden	31.8
U.K.	26.7
Canada	25.0
Norway	16.8
Netherlands	12.4
Denmark	11.6
Switzerland	9.7
Belgium	5.6
Italy	5.0
France	4.7
Libya	4.3
Kuwait	4.1
Iraq	3.5
Nigeria	3.1
China	2.0
EC (European Community)	$ 89.9

Source: World Refugee Survey 1982

Table V

1981 Contributions to International Refugee Aid Agencies—Top 20 Countries, Ranked by Contribution per Capita

Country	Population (In Millions)	Contribution (In Millions of $)*	Contribution Per Capita	Gross National Product Per Capita
Qatar	.2	$ 1.6	$8.05	$16,590
Norway	4.1	16.8	4.10	10,710
Sweden	8.3	31.9	3.84	11,920
Saudi Arabia	10.4	37.2	3.58	7,370
Kuwait	1.4	4.1	2.96	17,270
Denmark	5.1	11.6	2.27	11,900
Australia	14.8	33.5	2.26	9,100
Switzerland	6.3	9.7	1.53	14,240
U.S.	229.8	33	1.47	10,820
Libya	3.1	4.3	1.39	8,210
Liechtenstein	0.03	34.1	1.14	11,300
Canada	24.1	25.0	1.04	9,650
Netherlands	14.2	12.4	.88	10,240
United Arab Emirates	1.0	0.8	.80	15,590
Germany (FRG)	61.3	36.4	.59	11,730
Belgium	9.9	5.6	.56	10,890
Japan	117.8	63.1	.54	8,800
U.K.	55.9	26.7	.48	6,340
Luxembourg	0.4	0.2	.45	12,820
Finland	4.8	1.8	.38	8,260

Iceland, Ireland, Iraq, Jordan—$.21 to $.30 per capita

New Zealand, San Marino, Bahrain—$.11 to $.20 per capita

Bahamas, Austria, France, Greece, Italy, Malta, Monaco, Portugal, Spain, Israel, Lebanon, Oman, Syria—$.02 to $.10 per capita

53 countries including Argentina, Chile, Panama, Uruguay, Singapore, Cyprus—$.01 per capita or less

*1981 amounts reported by UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UN Relief and Works Agency, Intergovernmental Committee for Migration and World Food Program.

Source: World Refugee Survey 1982

The Ford Foundation is not alone among philanthropic organizations in making grants for work in the refugee and migration field. The United Nations Fund for Population Activities has been a major public supporter of migration studies; the Rockefeller Foundation's activities include sponsorship of a competition to support data-analysis projects concerning U.S. immigration; the German Marshall Fund supports studies of migration issues affecting countries of the industrialized world. Several more philanthropic organizations are contemplating grants for work in the refugee and migration field. But considering the magnitude of the problem, even the work begun and contemplated by the Ford Foundation and these other groups is not nearly enough.

The Ford Foundation thus would welcome the increased involvement of other funders--public and private--in work in the refugee and migration field, and Foundation staff are available for discussions with other funders about possible collaborative ventures. Given the persistence of the problems of refugees and migrants and the limited resources available to address them, such collaborative ventures may be the key to progress in the refugee and migration field in the years ahead.